

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include a change to Figure 1 to add the designation “Fig. 1.” Additionally, a new drawing sheet is added to show Figures 2 and 3. Specifically, Figure 2 is added to depict the memory means outside of the tuner IC, and Figure 3 is added to depict the memory means within the tuner IC. The additions of Figures 2 and 3 are supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the original specification on page 3, lines 6-9.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed November 17, 2008, claims 1, 3, and 4 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claim 1 is amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite memory means to store information regarding an operation of the receiver signal strength indication circuit of claim 1. Also, claims 5 and 6 are added. No claims are canceled. The amendments are supported, for example, by the subject matter described on page 2, lines 12-20, page 2, lines 24-30, page 3, lines 6-9, and page 3, lines 11-15, of the original specification.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 3, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation “the ADC means is configured to store an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level” of claim 1 lacks antecedent basis in the specification. Additionally, the Office Action submitted that the ADC means may be understood to only convert analog signals to digital signals. It should be noted that claim 1 is amended to recite a memory means configured at least to store an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations related to storing an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level are supported by the specification, even though there may not be explicit antecedent basis for the language. This language is supported by the specification, for example, at page 2, lines 12-20, which states “the RF as well as the detector signal level information together with the chosen amplifier settings can digitally be stored and serve as reference at other RF input levels. This measurement thus serves as absolute gain calibration point for the RSSI measurement.” (emphasis added). While

the indicated subject matter does not explicitly refer to storing “amplification” settings of the discretely controlled amplifying means, this description nevertheless provides support for each of the amended claim limitations because the indicated subject matter refers to storing (1) a radio-frequency (RF) signal level information as well as (2) detector signal level information together with (3) chosen amplifier settings. Additionally, the indicated subject matter indicates that these chosen amplifier settings (or “amplification” settings, as stated in claim 1) can serve as a reference at other RF input levels (or “reference to tune the circuit for a subsequent RF input level,” as stated in claim 1). Additionally, further support may be found for the language of claim 1 at page 2, lines 24-30, page 3, lines 6-9, and page 3, lines 11-15.

While the specification may not explicitly provide antecedent basis for the exact language used in the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the indicated language finds considerable support in the specification, including the support described above. See, MPEP 608.01(o) (“an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed”). Furthermore, 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1) requires the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable. In other words, support is required, and antecedent basis is simply one way of providing support, but is not the only way to provide support for the limitations of the claim.

Here, although the language of the claims differs somewhat from the actual nomenclature provided in the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim language is nevertheless supported by the specification because the claims recite limitations that are well within the scope of the embodiments described in the specification. Moreover, although the MPEP indicates that the use of a variety of terms can be confusing, Applicants respectfully submit that the terms used in the claims do not cause such confusion. On the contrary, the language of the claims is ascertainable from the specification, as shown by the explanation provided above.

Therefore, Applicants assert the claims are supported by the specification as filed because the language is within the scope of the written description provided in the specification, and the language does not cause confusion as to the meaning of the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,952,772, hereinafter Lampe) in view of Ryan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,151,759, hereinafter Ryan) and Toshida et al. (U.S. pat. No. 5,613,232, hereinafter Toshida). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Lampe, Ryan, and Toshida for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites “memory means to store an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication, wherein the stored amplification setting is configured to serve as a reference to tune the circuit for a subsequent RF input level” (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that the combination of Lampe, Ryan, and Toshida does not teach memory means to store an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication, wherein the stored amplification setting is configured to serve as a reference to tune the circuit for a subsequent RF input level, as recited in the claim. The Office Action does not assert Lampe or Ryan might teach a memory means to store amplification settings to serve as an RF input level reference. The Office Action merely asserts Toshida purportedly teaches an ADC means. However Toshida fails to teach a memory means to store amplification settings to serve as an RF input level reference.

Toshida merely teaches an analog-to-digital converter 20 and a detector circuit 19. Toshida, col. 12, lines 50-59. More specifically, Toshida merely teaches that the A/D converter 20 converts the data to digital and sends the digital data to a micro-processing unit MPU 30 for processing by the MPU 30. Toshida col. 12, lines 50-59.

Hence, Toshiba does not teach memory means to store an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication. Moreover, Toshiba does not teach a stored amplification setting is configured to serve as a reference to tune the circuit for a subsequent RF input level. Instead, Toshiba expressly teaches that the A/D converter 20 sends the converted data to the MPU 30 for processing by the MPU 30. In fact, Toshiba appears to be silent in regard to storing an amplification setting of discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first RF input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication in a memory device, and implementing the stored amplification setting relative to a first RF input level as a reference to tune the circuit for the subsequent RF input level.

Furthermore, even if Toshiba were understood to teach storing an amplification setting of discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first RF input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication in a memory device, Toshiba is nevertheless silent with regard to implementing a stored amplification setting relative to a first RF input level as a reference to tune a circuit for a subsequent RF input level.

Therefore, the combination of Lampe, Ryan, and Toshiba fails to teach all of the limitations of the claim because Toshiba does not teach storing an amplification setting of discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first RF input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication in a memory device, and implementing the stored amplification setting relative to the first RF input level as a reference to tune the circuit for the subsequent RF input level. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Lampe, Ryan, and Toshiba because the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims

Claims 3-6 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 3-6 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 3-6 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: February 17, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111